PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference M962-PCT International application No. PCT/JP2004/000239			FOR FURTHER A	CTION	See Form PCT/IPEA/416		
			International filing date 15.01.2004	(day/month/year)	Priority date <i>(daylmonthiyear)</i> 15.01.2003		
	rnational Patent Class 2C38/00, C23C2/		ational classification and II	PC			
	olicant PPON STEEL CC	RPORATION 6	et al.				
1.	This report is the Authority under A	international pre Article 35 and trar	liminary examination rensmitted to the applican	port, established by t	this International Preliminary Examining 36.		
2.	This REPORT co	onsists of a total of	of 6 sheets, including th	nis cover sheet.			
3.	This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, comprising:						
	a. sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau) a total of sheets, as follows:						
	sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).						
	beyo	ts which supersed nd the disclosure lemental Box.	de earlier sheets, but w in the international app	hich this Authority co dication as filed, as in	nsiders contain an amendment that goes dicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the		
	b. (sent to the International Bureau only) a total of (indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)), containing a sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in computer readable form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).						
4.	This report conta	ins indications re	elating to the following it	ems:			
	⊠ Box No. I	Basis of the opin	nion		·		
	☐ Box No. II	Priority					
	☐ Box No. III	•	ent of opinion with rega	ard to novelty, inventiv	ve step and industrial applicability		
	☐ Box No. IV	Lack of unity of	invention				
	⊠ Box No. V	Reasoned state applicability; cita	ment under Article 35(2 ations and explanations	 with regard to nove supporting such stat 	lty, inventive step or industrial ement		
	☐ Box No. VI	Certain docume	ents cited				
	☐ Box No. VII		in the international app				
	☐ Box No. VIII	Certain observa	tions on the internation	al application			
Dat	e of submission of the	demand		Date of completion of	this report		
26.03.2004				18.01.2005			
Name and mailing address of the international			ıal	Authorized Officer			
prei	D-80298 M	Patent Office	56 eomu d	Rolle, S			
_		9 2399 - 0 18. 5230	oo apinu u	Telephone No. +49 8	9 2399-7980		

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

JC20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 1 4 JULI 2005 No. PCT/JP2004/000239

_	Box No. I	Basis of the report				
1.	With regardiled, unles	With regard to the language , this report is based on the international application in the language in which it was iled, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
	☐ This re which	eport is based on translations from the original language into the following language , is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:				
	☐ pul	ernational search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)) blication of the international application (under Rule 12.4) ernational preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)				
2.	have been	With regard to the elements* of the international application, this report is based on <i>(replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report):</i>				
	Description	ı, Pages				
	1-55	as originally filed -				
	Claims, Nu	mbers				
	1-13	as originally filed				
	Drawings,	Sheets				
	1/4-4/4	as originally filed				
	□ a sequ	ence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing				
3.	☐ the ☐ the ☐ the ☐ the	mendments have resulted in the cancellation of: description, pages claims, Nos. drawings, sheets/figs sequence listing (specify): v table(s) related to sequence listing (specify):				
4.	had not be Supplemer the the the	eport has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below en made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the ntal Box (Rule 70.2(c)). description, pages claims, Nos. drawings, sheets/figs sequence listing (specify): trable(s) related to sequence listing (specify):				
	* If it	em 4 applies, some or all of these sheets may be marked "superseded."				

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/JP2004/000239

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-13

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No:

Claims 1-13

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-13

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7):

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- Reference is made to the following document:
 D1: EP-A-1 160 346 (NIPPON STEEL CORP) 5 December 2001 (2001-12-05)
- 2. Novelty
- 2.1 Document **D1** discloses (cf. claim 1, paragraphs 6, 10, Tab.1 and 2, Example a) a hot-dip galvanized steel sheet having a steel composition consisting of (in weight %): 0.05-0.2% C, 0.2-2.0% Si, 0.2-2.5% Mn, 0.01-1.5% Al, 0.2-5.0% Ni, P< 0.03%, S< 0.02%, with the balance being Fe and usual impurities. This alloy overlaps broadly with the alloy claimed in claim 1 of the present application. Examples in Tab.1 in D1 fall in the composition range of claim 1 of the present application and fulfill the relationship in claim 1 (cf. e.g. Example a in Tab.1). D1 also discloses a method (cf. claims 13 and 14, paragraphs 45, 46) for producing a high-strength hot-dip galvanized steel sheet with the method steps: hot rolling, cold rolling, annealing from 10 seconds to 6 minutes in the two-phase temperature range of 650-900° C, cooling to 350-500° C at a cooling rate of 2-200° C/s, hot-dip galvanizing, and then cooling to below 250° C at a cooling rate of at least 5° C/s, which is the same as in claim 7 of the present application.

 The occupation of 5-80% of the steel sheet surface with oxides is not disclosed in D1. However, since the alloy composition and the manufacturing method are the same, the microstructure must inevitably also be the same. The microstructure of D1 is therefore
- 2.2 Hence, the hot-dip galvanized steel sheet of **claim 1** is not novel (Article 33(2) PCT). The same may be said of the hot-dip galvanized steel sheet in **claims 2-6 and 11-13**.
- 2.3 Also, the methods of claims 7 abd 8 are not novel (Article 33(2) PCT). Claims 9 and 10 do not seem to contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step, see document D1 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.
- 3. Remarks

inherently the same as that claimed.

3.1 The present set of claims comprises a plurality of independent product and process claims, in particular there are three claims (claims 1,5 and 6) relating to an alloy per se and four process claims (claims 7-10). This is, firstly, considered to be not concise within the meaning of Art.6 PCT. Secondly, it obscures the precise nature of the inventive concept, to the extent that there may exist more than one inventive concept, Rule 13(1) PCT.

If there is one inventive concept, then it must be possible to draft one independent claim per category relating to the concept. If not, the applicant should consider filing divisional applications. The requirement of Art.6 concerning conciseness and clarity are not satisfied. Since claims 5 and 6 are de facto preferred embodiments of the steel of claim 1, then they should be indicated as such.

- 3.2. Alloys are largely dependent for their properties on the composition. Any slight variation in the composition will have implications for the properties which may even be completely unexpected and large. Hence, an independent claim relating to an alloy, in which the composition plays a role in determining the final properties must define the composition in a clear, precise and exhaustive manner. If it is not so defined, then the alloy composition may possibly not achieve the properties as set out in the application, in the present case attain an alloy with desired hot-dip galvanizing ability, tensile strength and workability properties. In such a case the alloy could not be inventive.
- 3.2.1. Terms such as "containing" when used without a balance, i.e. a balance of iron (claims 1,2,4,5,6), allow the inclusion of further unnamed elements in unspecified quantities, this resulting in an alloy with unforeseeable properties. In this particular case and as specified in the description, the effects and advantages of the invention are achieved with an alloy composition 100% defined.
- 3.2.2. The alloy composition of claim 1 is not exhaustively disclosed, since claims 2 and 4 allow further optional additions. Hence, **claim 1** is unclear. The optional additions of the dependent claims should be included in the main claims to which they refer.
- 3.2.3. The alloy composition of claims 5 and 6 seems to be not at all defined.
- 3.3. It is not clear from the wording in claim 1 if "the surface (area) of said steel sheet" is the steel surface or the hot-dip galvanized steel sheet surface.
- 3.4. Claim 1, which is directed towards a product, attempt to define the subject-matter in terms of a process: "after a hot-dip plating layer is dissolved by fuming nitric acid". However, such a definition is only allowable under the conditions, that the product as

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/000239

such fulfil the requirements for patentability, i.e. inter alia that it is new and inventive. A product is not rendered novel merely by the fact that it is produced by means of a new process. Therefore, claim 1 is also not clear. A similar objection applies to claims 11-12.